DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 548 HE 003 673

AUTHOR Leppaluoto, Jean R.
TITLE Attitude Change and Sex Discrimination: The Crunch Hypothesis.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 11p.; Paper presented before the Western Psychological Association 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Discriminatory Attitudes (Social); *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Federal Aid; *Higher Education; *Sex Discrimination; *Women Professors; *Womens Education

ABSTRACT

In the past, women have been discriminated against in higher education because of discriminatory attitudes that have led to unfair procedures in student admissions and faculty and staff employment. Most women in the academic world have found through experience that attitude change comes after behavioral changes have taken place. Thus, they have been pushing for changes on college campuses across the country that include the following: (1) to end nepotism policies because of the differential impact on wives; (2) to establish appropriate grievance procedures; (3) to revise tenure rules to include part-time work; (4) to establish child care centers; (5) to analyze fringe benefits; (6) to establish maternity leave policies that are fair; (7) to establish part-time work that is paid at a rate commensurate with full-time work, prorated; (8) to have open admissions for women in coeducational institutions; (9) to abolish student rules for one sex; and (10) to encourage women to return to school. With these changes that are being brought about primarily through the withholding of federal funds from institutions participating in discriminatory practices, it is hoped that related attitudinal change will also become a reality. (HS)

ED 071548

ATTITUDE CHANGE AND SEX DISCRIMINATION: THE CRUNCH HYPOTHESIS

Western Psychological Association
Portland, Oregon -- 1972

Jean R. Leppaluoto
University of Oregon

There is little experimental evidence to support the hypothesis that knowledge of an individual's attitude towards some object will allow one to predict the way the person will behave with respect to that object (Fishbein, 1967). Instead what evidence there is about a relationship between behavior and attitudes has been that a person tends to bring his attitudes into line with his behavior (e.g., Cohen, 1960; Gerard, 1965). Without knowing the psychological principles involved, women across the country and the world are applying pressure to bring about behavior change first with the assumption that attitudes will change once women have attained more equality.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 00 3 673

ATTITUDE CHANGE AND SEX DISCRIMINATION: THE CRUNCH HYPOTHESIS

Western Psychological Association
Portland, Oregon -- 1972

Jean R. Leppaluoto
University of Oregon

There is little experimental evidence to support the hypothesis that knowledge of an individual's attitude towards some object will allow one to predict the way the person will behave with respect to that object (Fishbein, 1967). Instead what evidence there is about a relationship between behavior and attitudes has been that a person tends to bring his attitudes into line with his behavior (e.g., Cohen, 1960; Gerard, 1965). Without knowing the psychological principles involved, women across the country and the world are applying pressure to bring about behavior change first with the assumption that attitudes will change once women have attained more equality.

Thanks to the press, the words "women's liberation" evoke images of radical, man-hating, bra-burning women. However, the more serious and important activities of the women's movement rarely get the attention of the press.

Concern over discrimination in education has led to formal charges of sex discrimination on more than 360 colleges and universities in the past two years (Sandler, 1972). None of these charges have yet been refuted by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in its subsequent investigations. Some of the finest institutions have been charged: Harvard University, Yale University, Columbia University, the University of Michigan, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Minnesota, the University of Chicago, and the entire state university and college systems of the states of New York, New Jersey, Florida, and California.

The changes that will be taking place on campuses offer us as psychologists an opportunity to study the effects of behavior and attitude changes. These changes are coming about because faculty, staff and students are examining their status by evaluating institutional policies and practices for their effect on women. They have documented that sex discrimination exists in higher education, which is merely a mirror of the larger society. Faculty and administration are being presented with formal accusations of discrimination and with demands for changes in hiring practices, personnel policies, student admissions, fringe benefits, curriculum content, etc.

Unlike other minorities, women often are not aware of the disadvantages they are up against or accept their situations as inevitable. What has become apparent is that sex discrimination is still a socially acceptable prejudice. Administrators, who are predominately white middle class males, verbalize understanding, but seldom act in accordance with these statements. Much of this is unconscious and not deliberate, but women are beginning to demand equal opportunities.

Although such discrimination against half the population is wasteful, it is not illegal, unless the Equal Rights Amendment is ratified. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, which forbids sex discrimination in employment, exempts faculty in educational institutions. Title VI of the same Act forbids discrimination in federally assisted programs, but only applies to race, color and national origin, not sex (Sandler, 1972). The Equal Pay Act excludes professional, executive and administrative employees. Even the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has no jurisdiction over sex discrimination; it is limited by law to race, color, religion, and national origin.

The only way sex discrimination in higher education is checked is by the Executive Order of the President which forbids federal contractors from discriminating in employment. It does not cover discrimination against students nor does it cover institutions which have no federal contracts. The enforcement by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been the subject of bitter criticism by women's groups and the university world. However, the investigations have been primarily responsible for generating the types of questions that have made women aware of the inequities in the college and university systems.

One of the major myths is that things are getting better for women. Yet study after study, including more than a thousand pages of hearings held by Representative Edith Green of Oregon, have shown that the position of women in academe has been deteriorating for years.

Statistical evidence reflects persistent barriers restricting women's educational opportunities. In 1920, 47 percent of all undergraduates were women and today the figure is 41 percent (VanDyk, 1972). The percentage of women graduate students is less now than it was in 1930. Despite an increase in women's college enrollment in the past decade, women have persisted in concentrating in college courses which prepare them for the traditional "women's professions." Of all women receiving degrees during the earliest and latest school years for which comparable data are available, the percentages for those majoring in selected subjects (Koontz, 1972):

	1968-1969	1954-1955
Teacher education	39	41
Humanities	17	16
Social sciences	15	10
Health professions	4	6
Natural sciences	4	3

During the 14-year period, these and other women's college majors did not change significantly.

The postwar faculty expansion was largely one of male expansion. The proportion of women faculty has dropped continuously over the past 100 years, from a third of the positions in 1870, to less than a fourth today (Sandler, 1972). The more prestigious the institution, the worse the status of women. Women are far more likely to end up at the lesser known institutions and in community colleges where they constitute about 40 percent of the faculty where the opportunity for professional advancement and research are less, and where the salaries are lower.

Women with the same qualifications as men are hired less frequently, at lower ranks, promoted more slowly, and receive less pay than their male counterparts. For example, the HEW investigation at Teachers College at Columbia University showed that the average compensation for women was lower than the average compensation for both sexes in all three academic ranks: for female assistant professors, $1500 less than for all assistant professors; for female associate professors, $700 less; and for full professors, $1000 less (Moore, 1972). Ninety percent of the men with doctorates and 20 years of academic experience will be full professors; for women with the identical qualifications, barely half will be at that rank (Sandler, 1972).

The primary reason for these inequities appears to be related to the myth that education is wasted on women, despite the fact that the more education a woman has the more likely she is to work, and despite the fact that 91 percent of the women with doctorates work. Eight-one percent of women doctorates in one study worked full-time; 79 percent had not interrupted their careers in the ten years after they got their doctorate (Sandler, 1972).

Throughout the academic world hiring is handled by calling a colleague and asking him for his best "man." This has perpetuated the myth that "qualified women" are hard to find. Surely because of quotas on admissions women are not on campuses in the numbers they could be, but too often, women are not hired in any number approaching the actual number of doctorates awarded to women. Bernice Sandler (1972, p. 4-5) tells the following anecdote about our own profession of psychology:

> In psychology, women receive 23 percent of all doctorates; that is about the same percentage of women listed as psychologists in the National Register of Scientific and Technological Personnel. In 1970-1971 at Rutgers, the percentage of women faculty was 9 percent; at the University of Maryland, 6 percent; at the University of Wisconsin, 3 percent; at Columbia University, ZERO percent, despite the fact that Columbia awarded about 36 percent of its doctorates in psychology to women. These are fairly typical figures; these institutions are no worse than others. At one well-known California institution, the two women hired this year were the first females hired for the faculty of the psychology department since 1924. The problem is not limited to psychology or to the institutions named. It is found in institution after institution, in department after department.

Most women in the academic world have found through experience that attitude change comes after behavioral changes have taken place. Therefore, they are instrumental in the revision of all policies that affect women in a negative way. Comprehensive plans of affirmative action are being developed to remedy the effects of past discrimination and to eliminate the barriers for future generations. All federal contractors are required to have such plans, but only within the last couple of years has HEW been enforcing compliance on this part of the university contractors. The changes that are needed are similar across all academic campuses and include the following:

--To end nepotism policies because of the differential impact on wives. Recently Stanford, Oberlin, and the University of Maine, Minnesota, and

Michigan revised or abolished their nepotism rules so that husbands and wives can work in the same department. The University of Oregon had ignored the nepotism rules and in the Psychology Department several couples had been employed, although the women were usually on a part-time non-tenured line basis. The State Board of Higher Education eliminated the nepotism rules in Oregon in 1971.

--To establish appropriate grievance procedures. Numerous women who have been actively fighting sex discrimination have lost their jobs and literally have no means of redress.

--To revise tenure rules to include part-time work. Already at Harvard, Princeton and Stanford, part-time faculty can ascend the tenure ladder to full professorship, albeit at a slower rate.

--To establish child care centers. These centers should be available to the children of both male and female faculty, staff and students.

--To analyze fringe benefits. TIAA and other retirement plans, based on actuarial tables, pay women less (16 percent less under TIAA), even though women contribute the same amount as the men with whom they have worked. The rationale is that women live longer. However, the mortality gap is greater between whites and blacks than between men and women, yet no insurance company would differentiate rates by race.

--To establish maternity leave policies that are fair. In some places women cannot use sick leave for childbirth, nor do they retain their jobs if they leave, even for a short period for childbirth or childrearing. On some campuses women faculty are not eligible for maternity benefits, but the wives of their colleagues are.

--To establish part-time work that is paid at a rate commensurate with full-time work, prorated. Fringe benefits could be prorated if necessary.

The issues brought out above primarily center around equal employment opportunities. The Executive Order for federal contractors requires that women be given equal employment opportunities. Thus, the affirmative action plans must include highly developed plans to recruit, hire and promote women and must have review mechanisms to implement and evaluate the effectiveness of the plans. To insure that the employment pool has qualified women, several important steps need to be taken, including, but not limited to, the following:

--To have open admissions for women in coeducational institutions. Many institutions place a ceiling on the number of qualified women students they will admit, while permitting admittance of men with lower qualifications.

--To abolish student rules for one sex. Women students still have more restrictions in terms of hours and the freedom to live off campus. Urological services are available for male students, but gynecological services are not available for women students.

--To include part-time students at the graduate and undergraduate levels. These rules make it particularly difficult for a low income person to return to school.

--To encourage women to return to school. Many schools welcome retired military personnel to return to school to prepare for a second career, but discourage women who wish to return for the identical training. For example, at the University of Oregon if you have graduated and want to change fields you cannot be admitted as an undergraduate but if you do not meet the graduate

requirements you cannot be admitted as a graduate. Even the universities have their Catch-22s.

Several innovative plans have been developed to enhance the opportunities for women to return to school. The following plans are illustrative of what is being done to change the universities so that women can return to further their educational and occupational aspirations (Koontz, 1972):

--Continuing Education for Women are programs tailored to meet the special needs and interests of women returning to school, and have such necessary features as: enrollment on a part-time basis, flexible course hours, short-term courses, counseling services for adult women, financial aid for part-time study, limited residence requirements, removal of age restrictions, liberal transfer of course credits, curriculum geared to adult experience, information services, credit by examination, child care facilities, refresher courses, and job placement assistance.

--The Open University and External Degrees plans are reforms of the current educational structure. Learning outside the conventional instructional program might involve correspondence courses, video cassettes, apprenticeships, work experience, TV courses, and other teaching innovations.

--Education for "Nontraditional Professions" is needed if more than two-thirds of the 4 1/3 million professionally employed women are not to be concentrated in 5 professions (teaching, nursing, social work, library work, and dietetics).

It is apparent that improvements in women's educational and employment opportunities will require basic attitudinal changes on the part of all groups in society, including women themselves. Due to these unusual

circumstances, individuals are testing the effectiveness of the "crunch hypothesis." That is, the top and the bottom get together and let those in the middle know that changes must take place immediately.

Those at the top are the HEW contract compliance investigators and the top University administrators who are cognizant of the importance of complying with the Executive Order. HEW can withhold government contract money. For example, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) rejected Columbia University's latest proposal to bar job discrimination and said it would continue to withhold $13.8 million in government contract previously awarded to the university. The rejection marks the third time in two years that HEW has turned down an affirmative action plan offered by Columbia (Davis, 1972).

The women and men at the low end of the power structure are involved in writing anti-discrimination policy statements and in setting up programs to eliminate sex discrimination. Therefore, universities soon should be reflecting the needed changes, e.g., equal pay for equal jobs, equal opportunity for employment, etc. Hard data are being collected which will indicate whether or not the "crunch hypothesis" is validly changing behavior and bringing about related attitudinal change.

References

Cohen, A. R. Attitudinal consequences of induced discrepancies between cognitions and behavior. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1960, 24, 297-318.

Davis, S. Education: Columbia is a loser. The Spokeswoman, vol. 2, No. 9, March 1, 1972.

Fishbein, M. Attitude and prediction of behavior. In M. Fishbein (Ed.), Readings in attitude theory and measurement. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967, 477-492.

Gerard, H. B. Deviation, conformity, and commitment. In I. D. Steiner and M. Fishbein (Eds.), Current studies in social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965, pp. 263-277.

Koontz, K. D. Plans for widening women's educational opportunities. Wingspread Conference on Women's Higher Education: Some Unanswered Questions, March 13, 1972.

Moore, B. J. (Ed.) Second sex complaint filed against Teachers College. Women Today, vol. II, No. 5, March 6, 1972.

Sandler, B. Women and higher education: where do we go from here? Wingspread Conference on Women's Higher Education: Some Unanswered Questions, March 13, 1972.

Van Dyk, J. Graduate women: investigating the question of the drop-out rate. Wingspread Conference on Women's Higher Education: Some Unanswered Questions, March 13, 1972.